

MEETING MINUTES
NAVIGATION ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
Moline Holiday Inn
September 15, 1993

September 15, 1993:

1. The meeting was called to order at 8: 00 a. m. Representatives were present from the five Upper Mississippi River (UMR) states and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Corps of Engineers (Corps) attendees included staff from the Rock Island (CENCR), St. Paul (CENCS) and St. Louis (CELMS) Districts, and the North Central (CENCD) and Lower Mississippi Valley (CELMV) Divisions. Also in attendance were David Soong of the Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS) and Jerry Rombach of MARC 2000. A complete list of attendees is attached to these minutes.

2. **Minutes of Last Meeting** - Members requested clarification and presented corrections to the draft minutes of the last meeting (July 13, 1993). Jon Duyvejonck asked what the word 'sensitive' meant as used in the first sentence of p. 2. Ken Barr responded that cost/benefit ratios are important in determining study direction, and thus need continual refinement. Jon also requested that the words 'improve on' in the fourth sentence, p. 2, be changed to 'accelerate'. To correct the last sentence of the first paragraph. p. 5, Jon noted that he did formally request the Environmental work group to provide an outline of intended Corps efforts to address the future-without condition.

3. **Environmental Roundtable** - Dorie Bollman gave an overview of the Environmental Roundtable which will be held November 2-4, 1993, at the Interlaken Resort in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. This is the 9th annual Roundtable, which was originally designed to resolve issues of concern between Federal agencies charged with land management responsibilities; the agenda topics are proposed by a committee of agency representatives. The host agency then makes the final arrangements. Dorie said the Roundtable is geared toward upper-level staff with some participation by 'worker bees'. Mike Cockerill added that the meeting has always had a midwest area focus. Dorie noted that the tentative keynote speaker is Carol Browner, administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Ms. Browner's availability is still uncertain, so two backup plans are in place for a speaker. Dorie noted the participation of several NECC members at the Roundtable. Bill Dieffenbach expressed surprise that he was included on the agenda, and said he will likely be unable to attend. Mike Cockerill urged him to keep in touch so that a replacement can be found if necessary. Steve Johnson suggested pairing Kevin Szcodronski's presentation with that of Joel Kaplan, since their topics are similar. Dorie and Mike said some flexibility exists in the agenda, but it was questioned if Kevin would be able to switch dates; Steve said he did not want to press the issue too much. Mike noted the many headaches with the numerous additions, deletions and adjustments to the agenda. Dorie said that her goal was to link the proposed Ecosystem Management Strategy with the overall Roundtable theme. Kevin Szcodronski suggested that the wording of his presentation could be changed to '(Ecosystem Management Strategies) for the Upper Mississippi 'rather than ' . . . in Response to Corps Navigation Study Initiative'; he said he will also visit with Joel Kaplan on this matter. Steve Johnson asked if agency heads (i.e. Washington level) attended the Roundtable. Dorie and Mike responded that no, attendees are usually regional administrator types.

4. Flood Effects on Navigation Study - Ken Barr stated that the Corps has done significant personnel reshuffling in response to post-flood work, in some cases reassigning people who had been working on the navigation studies. Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid summarized the status of the various work groups (WGs). She said that the Public Involvement WG has delayed their meeting until November. The Engineering WG has lost about 10 weeks due to flood-related responsibilities. The Environmental WG is also slowing due to similar work. Finally, she said that the Economics WG, small to begin with, has also been delayed, and may enlist the help of other Corps districts. Ken asked Jon Duyvejonck what the FWS was scheduled to accomplish in 1993, and how the flood has affected it. Jon responded that PL 99 (emergency flood repair), FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) and SCS (Soil Conservation Service) work is diverting some efforts; work involves both the Rock Island and St. Louis Corps Districts. Currently 5-6 staff members are involved in flood-related work, with 3-4 other on the way to help. Jon added that he has passed off some flood duties to others, but there remains much ongoing coordination with their Washington, D.C. office. He said he will concentrate on his involvement with the environmental technical work groups. Ken added that in the Rock Island District, we will simply see how things play out. Steve Johnson noted that more flooding is almost certain in the spring, so further scheduling problems are likely in the future. He asked what happened south of Cairo; several attendees responded that due to the extremely wide river channel in this area, there were no problems.

5. Standard Procedures for Work Groups - Ken Barr referred to the letter (included in the meeting materials) dated July 28, 1993 from Gretchen Benjamin of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to the Corps, Rock Island. The letters' main point was to request that a confirmed list of Work Group members be provided to the NECC 30 days prior to the first meeting of the group. Ken said that the Corps will strive to adhere to this request. Jon Duyvejonck asked if issues such as having a recorder at work group meetings are open for discussion. Ken responded affirmatively, but asked that the discussion be deferred until after item 6. of the agenda. This was agreed to.

6. Mussel Impact Work Group Report - Tom Keevin, who facilitated the first meeting of this work group, distributed the latest draft study plan. He emphasized that it is a very preliminary, and at this point for information only and not to be distributed beyond NECC members. Tom added that further input will be sought from the work group (their comments are due by October 15), and then a revised version will be sent back to the work group and the agencies. Steve Johnson asked how long the agency review period will be, and Tom responded that it will probably be 30 days. Tom noted that the minutes of the last NECC meeting included Richard Neves as a work group participant. In fact, he was unable to participate, and was replaced by Theresa Niemo.

The entire work group consisted of Drew Miller, Tom Nalepa, Pam Thiel, Shaio Wang, Dave Schaeffer, Kurt Welke and Theresa Niemo. In describing the meeting proceedings, Tom said it ran two days, but this was probably not enough. The entire first day involved general discussions, and Tom hoped that the second day would begin the composition of the study plan. But writing did not begin until the middle of the second day, and a consolidated plan did not materialize. Enough of a core existed however for Drew Miller to take back and complete. The question of 'how do we proceed?' was raised. Tom said that it is a difficult topic, a NEPA-type study to determine what potential navigation traffic increases will do to mussels. He said that 5 sites are proposed to be studied, and 2 types of databases developed from existing information -for populations and individuals (measurements of condition). From here, a two phased approach will be followed. The first phase will examine possible correlation between traffic levels and information in the two databases. In phase 2, model development will determine the degree of further data collection needed, particularly at the individual level. Laboratory studies may be necessary for certain data. At this point, Tom continued, we will look at what we have, possibly reconvene the work group or correspond by letter, and come up with a final product.

Steve Johnson interjected that the without-project condition (assuming the phasing out of navigation on the system) must be looked at, and stated that the minutes must reflect that their position on this issue has not changed -and will be reinforced repeatedly. Tom said that the Corps disagrees, that the law (NEPA and the CEQ Guidelines) says we must look at the likely future, i.e., with navigation. He added that navigation may not increase, but it will still be there. Tom added that this is what NEPA requires of a federal agency, not really 'our' (the Corps) position, and again emphasized the draft nature of the current mussel study plan. Review of the plan was discussed, and as a result the Corps will attempt to provide 45 days for this. Jon asked if minutes will be prepared at future work group meetings; he said he personally prepared a 2-page summary of the first meeting, but did not consider them as 'minutes'. Tom Keevin noted that this subject has been discussed, and it is generally agreed that the facilitator could not record minutes, and a formal recorder (e.g., court reporter) would generate an overly voluminous amount of material. A compromise may be to employ a department (Corps) secretary to record the minutes. Ken Barr also asked Jon to continue to record the significant high points of the discussion at future work group meetings. Kevin Szcodronski asked how long Phase 1 would last, and who would conduct the work. Tom responded that this phase will last approximately 3 months, and that Drew Miller is basically the main player now, with assistance from other Waterways Experiment Station (WES) personnel.

7. Adult Fish Work Group Report - Dan Wilcox provided a summary of the work group activities, starting with the meeting which was held in July in St. Louis. Work group members are as follows: Dr. Charles Liston, Dr. Glen Cada, Dr. Steve Gutreuter, Jan Hoover, Dick Kasul and Dr. Robert Sheehan. Dan also distributed a current draft of the work group study plan. He said that the work group meeting lasted two days, and consisted mostly of brainstorming amidst a healthy and open discussion. No writing took place until late into the second day. A rough product was generated, and was subsequently re-worked by Dan and Steve Gutreuter of the Environmental Management Technical Center Dan again (EMTC). Dan again emphasized the draft nature of the plan. It is uncertain if the group will reconvene or correspond via letter, but Dan said there is a need to fill in the blanks, especially on proposed statistical approaches. He went on to summarize the objectives of the study, in particular noting the determination of impact mechanisms from propeller entrainment and disturbance by hydraulic effects. Several possible modeling approaches exist, and Dan summarized these as well as some equations contained in the study plan. These equations primarily aim to determine the rates of fish mortality due to propeller entrainment, and subsequently relating these rates to losses over the entire river system and for potential incremental increases in navigation traffic. The work group still needs to develop an impact assessment approach for disturbance from passing vessels.

Kevin Szcodronski asked if there is a relationship between towboat passage and entrainment effects. Dan said yes, but it needs more development. He went on to explain that most previous studies have examined larval fish relative to power plant entrainment, so the present study is somewhat unique in its development. He added that the WES is conducting hydraulic modeling to determine the volume of water which is passed through a towboat propeller. These results will in turn help in development of the entrainment models and determination of the percentage of fish in the main channel which could be affected. Kevin noted that fish may be stunned by a passing boat, but not killed, and then killed by another boat passing right behind; how do we account for this? Dan referred to the Hudson River entrainment studies, and the large number of assumptions which they contained to account for uncertainties such as this. He said that it is no small feat to develop a model which all the players can agree to; it is still up to the work group to see which approach is best. Kevin noted the big difference in that boats are moving versus power plants which are stationary; tows 'go to the fish,' not vice-versa. Bill Dieffenbach felt that it is misleading to run fish through a pipe (into the propeller) to ascertain the rate of entrainment mortality. Jon Duyvejonck and Bernie Schonhoff clarified by saying that the pipe is used only to introduce the fish, and it does not bias the propeller effects. Ken Barr asked where the work group goes from here. Tom Keevin responded that the draft work plan still needs to go back to the work group, and the NECC may

receive it for review within the next couple of months. Bernie Schonhoff felt that much work yet remains for the work group, and again asked if they may reconvene. Tom noted that the initial product has been filled out by Dan Wilcox and Steve Gutreuter, and that it may be sent back to the work group yet this week (week of 9/13) or early next week (week of 9/20). It is possible that a portion of the group may meet again, but Tom noted the expense of holding these meetings presents difficulties. Steve Johnson repeated his earlier remarks on the Corps looking at the future-without condition; the Corps response also remained the same.

Bernie Schonhoff opined that the work group participants need more background material on the UMRS-IWW system prior to sitting down at the meetings, reasoning that time spent in providing this information at the meeting could have gone toward specific plan development. Dan Wilcox disagreed, saying that the group brought good experience from other areas, including large rivers experience. Bernie reiterated that background information is needed, and Tom Keevin asked what type, noting that pertinent literature was sent to the mussel and larval fish groups. Bernie agreed that provision of pertinent literature is a good idea. Tom noted in turn the paucity of available literature on adult fish and propeller/towboat effects. Bernie added that a facilitator/note-taker could help keep the meetings on track, which is needed. Tom said he perhaps gave the adult fish group too much free reign, but a balance is needed between 'discipline' and stifling important discussion. Dan noted that some ideas were written on the chalkboard at the meeting; perhaps this helped to guide the discussion. Tim Schlagenhaft felt that navigation impacts to fish are perhaps insignificant compared to loss of backwaters, sedimentation effects, etc. Dan Wilcox said that the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has a history of being very interested in assessment of fish entrainment impacts at power plants. Ken Barr said this study (adult fish) does not stand-alone; other studies will address navigation effects on side channel and backwater sedimentation.

8. Revisiting Agenda Item 4) - Coming back to the subject of standard operating procedures for work groups, Ken Barr said that it was probably adequately covered in the last two discussion segments. Kevin Szcodronski asked if the work group experts will be held 'accountable' for the products, outcomes or future progress of the studies. Dan Wilcox responded that names can be put on the study plans, and they can be contacted in the future if needed; they will not disappear. Kevin asked what exactly is the future. Ken Barr did not foresee actual quality control by the experts, but that they could be consulted further for additional biological expertise; monitoring will be the Corps' and states' responsibility. Dan Wilcox reiterated that the work groups' main responsibility is study plan preparation. Kevin Szcodronski asked if the groups are preparing a Corps product; Ken Barr answered yes, they are. Tom Keevin noted that what appeared in the IPMP were not really scopes of work; experts were needed to refine these and assist the Corps in going in the proper direction. This expertise did not exist for the POS and IPMP preparation groups; it was needed and good people have been assembled to provide it. He added that the final scopes of work are contractual documents, and therefore names will probably not appear on them. Dan Wilcox said that real 'nuts-and-bolts' input was needed, and this was given by the work groups; now, the NECC must pay close attention to these plans so agreement can be reached on their direction.

Bill Dieffenbach asked if any of the preliminary documents lead us to believe that budget constraints could be a problem in carrying out the studies. Dan Wilcox answered that two outcomes are possible: 1) the group will find a 'better way to skin a cat' and cost will be reduced; and, 2) more dollars are needed than budgeted. In the second case, Dan said we must have good justification, via an expert, clearly defined study plan, to seek more money. Mike Cockerill also suggested two possible scenarios: 1) in preparing original cost estimates, we did not have expert input, and now that we do -more money is needed; and, 2) we may need to 'bite the bullet' and streamline down a possible study('s) approach, to accommodate as much as possible all proposed studies; prioritization may also be needed. Bill Dieffenbach asked if the NECC would help with such prioritization, and Mike answered yes. Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid noted that Corps headquarters should be open to possible dollar increases if well justified, and she has sensed this kind of support. Mike Cockerill cited the Reconnaissance Resolution Conference as an example of this give and

take. At this point Ken Barr asked if there were any other comments. Jon Duyvejonck questioned the incorporation of the physical effects study data into the other work group studies; will these results be available? Jon noted that some concern was raised by the work groups on this data availability, and he wants to be sure that this issue is at the forefront, and the physical forces results are made available as needed. Rich Astrack asked Jon if he meant the data being available at all or within the needed time frame; Jon said he meant the latter. Ken Barr said that the very reason for these studies is to have the data available for use by the other groups. Jon felt that the adult fish group designed their study plan under the assumption that the physical forces data would not be available for three years, and that another study direction may have been possible had the data been available sooner or in an ongoing manner. Dan Wilcox restated that the data will be available, though not right now, and the work group must take this into account and schedule things appropriately. Jon thought this delay in data availability must be taken into consideration by the work group, and it should be documented somewhere that the work group is aware of this. Dan said that the work group will be asked 'how do we approach the study with or without the data?' Tom Keevin asserted that it was made clear to the group that it would be best to proceed with the data, but it is just not available now; in other words, they were made aware. He added that there should not be any surprises; physical effects are understood, but the level of understanding is the question. The measurement level will be better. Dan said the current study plan includes a section on input requirements, i. e., what are the necessary ingredients. Also, Ken Barr and Tom Keevin said that interim data will be available. Tom invited Jon Duyvejonck to consult with him prior to work group meetings to arrive at a statement which could be given to the work group on this issue. Jon cautioned against getting down the road 3-4 years and then finding that more data is needed. Mike Cocker-ill and Tom Keevin suggested that the work groups need to identify what they need right up front. Rich Astrack added that basic research can be accomplished prior to the physical forces data becoming available; this includes development of methods and techniques and building of assumptions. Jon asked that the point not be belabored, and agreed that the work group should tell us what they need up front.

9. Status of Modeling Work Group and TCC (Technical Coordinating Committee) - Bob Vanderjack referred to the list of candidates for the modeling work group (MMTWG) included in the meeting folder. He said that despite the list being marked 'tentative,' it is a final list and is tentative only because of procurement uncertainties. Bob also explained the meeting schedule for the group (four meetings will be held between September 1993 and January 1994) and the provision of products (a draft study plan will be delivered by March 1994). Bob emphasized that the group is not developing a model but a study plan to develop the model. Jon Duyvejonck asked if the list is based on having a separate modeling work group and TCC. Bob said that it is. Bob noted that Jeff Holland of the Corps Waterways Experiment Station (WES) will facilitate the group, and the first meeting could be held as early as next month. Bob will give as much lead time as possible on the date and location to facilitate NECC member participation. The most convenient, likely location for the first meeting is the Vicksburg, Mississippi vicinity; Bob thought that others may be held in a more convenient location. Bob asked the NECC members to notify him if they plan to attend.

Regarding the TCC, Bob noted the original list of candidates (Heinz Stefan, John Cairns and Robert Costanza) and explained the difficulties encountered in obtaining them. He said that at this point he is not very optimistic about Costanza and Stefan, and that Cairns is definitely out. Conflicting commitments seem to be the major difficulty. Bob said that other individuals may be available, and also said that the possibility of using the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) is being explored. He went on to say that discussions with the NAS have thus far been fruitful, and he has received a package of information and sample products produced by the Academy. Also, Bob noted that the Academy has done considerable work for the Corps in the past. Dan Wilcox also mentioned that an organization like Oak Ridge National Lab may be another possibility for TCC personnel. Jon Duyvejonck asked if any specific information was available on the NAS, and requested to see it along with the people who may be involved. Dan Wilcox said

that before NAS or Oak Ridge is retained, the NECC will have a chance to review the candidates. He added that we all want the best possible candidates, and that a group of individual scientists must still be assembled. Ken Barr urged that any concerns on the formation of the TCC should be provided immediately in order to keep moving. Kevin Szcodronski noted that using the NAS may be a good move, as the Izaak Walton League, for example, wanted their involvement in the first place. Mike Cockerill noted that this could raise the scientific validity of the study, and the credibility of the results. Dan Wilcox mentioned a recent publication by the NAS on large river restoration as an example of the quality work they produce, but nonetheless review of individual candidates will be necessary. Ken Barr said that a conference call will be arranged with the designated NECC representatives to review and approve the TCC group. Rich Astrack reiterated the need to move out on this issue, and said if there is a delay in arranging such a teleconference, that review should be accomplished at the next NECC meeting.

10. Data Collection Efforts for Site Impact Assessments - Jon Duyvejonck summarized the efforts here, saying that flood-related work has diverted his involvement, and that Terri Jacobson will do most of the legwork. Terri is currently conducting a literature survey on endangered species, using some data from the Planning Aid Reports for L/D 26; she is also canvassing states via their natural resource agencies as well as other FWS units. Photo-mosaics of the intended site-specific L/D sites have been obtained from the Corps. Jon also mentioned a recent meeting with the Illinois Natural History Survey, where information was obtained on their available resources data bases and possibilities for accessing them. Ken Barr mentioned that 17 'site specific' locations were identified in the reconnaissance report; Dan Wilcox asked which ones they were. Ken responded that the lower 5 on the Mississippi and two in the IWW are now being emphasized. Jon stated the importance of moving out in this area as well, so that restoration/enhancement opportunities can be identified concurrent with the engineering studies; he meant this as a 'heads-up' for the NECC members to think about opportunities at these sites.

11. Proposed Schedule for Upcoming Work Group Meetings - Tom Keevin said that the group on early life stages of fish and drawdown impacts will meet next week (September 21-23) in St. Louis. Dan Wilcox said that the plant studies group is in preparation, and will likely meet in November. Ken Barr noted that no other groups are currently scheduled to meet. Kevin Szcodronski asked if the members of these two groups have been identified, and the answer was yes, and the NECC was consulted. Rich Astrack thought other groups may meet yet this year, namely the side channel/backwater sedimentation group which will meet with the recreation impacts group. Ken Barr suggested that a date two weeks from now should be set as a deadline for NECC members to submit possible members for this group.

Steve Johnson asked if the recreation studies are looking at sedimentation effects rather than entrainment. Dan Wilcox and Rich Astrack responded affirmatively. Steve questioned why the St. Louis District has the lead on the recreation study, when 44% of the recreation activity occurs in the St. Paul District. Rich Astrack questioned this figure. Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid noted that St. Louis has the environmental lead, but St. Paul has the economics lead for the recreation studies. Steve said that travel to St. Louis is difficult due to tight budgets, and that there are many people in the St Paul area interested in recreation. Kevin Szcodronski expressed confusion as to what the recreation studies mean; several responders noted that the study was outlined in the IPMP. Ken Barr said that the gist of the study involves increased sediment resuspension due to boating activity, and locking conflicts between recreational and commercial vessels. Are we then looking for 'hydraulics types' for this work group, Kevin asked? Mike Cockerill said yes, that this is what the study is supposed to do; it is not a full-blown recreation analysis. Steve Johnson noted that hydraulic impacts have been studied by the MNDNR and the (EMTC), among others, so the possibility exists to piggyback onto these studies. Mike added that there is no intent to exclude the northern areas, and the study is meant to be tied closely to the side channel/backwater sedimentation study. Dan Wilcox suggested that recreational boat waves may be a significant factor, and that a technical work group can be assembled to do the subject justice. Steve Johnson said that the lack of

Minnesota attendance at work group meetings does not reflect disinterest; budgets are a real problem, and he 'pleaded' for a more convenient location for meetings.

12. Governor's POC Meeting -Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid attended this meeting held in conjunction with the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association (UMRBA) meeting on 31 August in Lacrosse, WI. She said that the official name of the group is now the Governor's Liaison (GLC). The committee is still getting oriented, and will be more specific on group objectives at a later time; currently they are working under a set of draft objectives prepared by the Corps' North Central Division (NCD). One feeling of the committee, Teresa said, is that other navigation study disciplines need to be explored besides the Environmental group; The Economics, Public Information and Engineering groups are also being considered for additional state POC designees, and a letter has been sent out on this issue. She added that future meetings of the GLC may concentrate on a particular issue, and relayed that Ron Nargang, the Minnesota Governor's representative, asked that study specifics be dealt with at levels other than the GLC. It is possible that another NECC-type group will be established for economics. Teresa presented the IPMP at the GLC meeting, and relative to this, urged that communication be maintained between the Governor's POCs and the NECC representatives. The question was raised of expanding the GLC to include Federal resource agency representation. For now, the group will remain as it is, but will welcome other agency input. The next meeting of the GLC will take place on November 16-17, again in conjunction with the UMRBA meeting; tentative location is Des Moines.

Ken Barr requested that a report of the first meeting be provided to the NECC members, and Teresa said this will be done. Jerry Rombach asked if the list of POCs distributed at the last NECC meeting still reflects the current membership. Teresa said the Missouri representative had an alternate, but that yes, the list is still accurate. Jon Duyvejonck asked the broader question of how the GLC will interface with the NECC - will the NECC or the GLC reflect the 'official' state position? Ken said the intent is to have the GLC reflect the state position, and reiterated the importance of close communication between the NECC and the GLC. Teresa mentioned that she gave the GLC a list of the NECC membership and encouraged continued communication between the two bodies. Jon Duyvejonck asked if information will be filtered through the governors themselves; Teresa said it will, and the challenge may be in the timing of meetings between the GLC and the NECC in order to facilitate the movement of this information. Kevin Szcodronski asked what we will do with recommendations from the GLC. Teresa responded that the Corps will consider the recommendations made and take action where possible.

13. Approaches to Issue Resolution - Ken Barr noted that there is a need for issue discussion rather than Corps 'updates'. For example, Ken said the issue raised by Steve Johnson could be clearly defined here (NECC), and then forwarded to the Governor's Liaison Committee and IPR if necessary. Dan Wilcox felt that this issue is a NEPA-related question, best dealt with at the policy-making level. He added that future policy will most likely include navigation, and that a forum suggested by Ken (to include legal people, policy-makers, etc.) is a good one to deal with these issues. Ken pondered how we should address such issues now rather than 6 years from now in a NEPA document. Don Williams stated that the issue needs some clarification before more discussion takes place.

At this point, Steve Johnson read from a letter from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to Col. Albert Krause, District Engineer, Rock Island District COE. This letter regarded input on the IPMP to the Reconnaissance Review Conference in December, 1992. Steve read the following excerpt:

"As described in the IPMP, the Feasibility Study is pointed toward construction that would commit the nation to continued operation of a pooled river system for generations to come. In evaluating environmental issues in the Feasibility Study, it is essential that the environmental effects of continuation of the pooled river system be addressed, not just the effects of incremental increases in navigation traffic.

We have reached a turning point in the 50-year history of navigation on the Mississippi River, and will move in one of two directions. One direction is that described in the IPMP: increasing traffic creates demands for an expanded navigation system and eventual reconstruction of the navigation infrastructure. The other direction sees no expansion or reconstruction of the system, with producers gradually relying more and more on other modes of transportation or bulk commodity processing; eventually, in another 50 years or so, the navigation infrastructure is no longer needed by the American economy.

For this reason, it is clear that the Feasibility Study's 'without project' condition must be an analysis of the eventual abandonment of the maintained navigation system and the return of a natural river environment. The environmental questions to be compared, then, are the 'with project' condition of an expanded navigation system, or the 'without project' condition of removal of the pooled river system."

Steve added that expansion would be needed if the system is intended to be used for more than the next 50 years; as it is now, is 50 more years feasible, he asked? Don Williams felt that this was more of an attack on economics; perhaps our economic analysis needs to take this into account through sensitivity analysis or some other method. Steve responded that certainly there is an economic piece. Dan Wilcox said that yes, we do need to look at what would happen without future navigation expansion. Much will depend on the outcome of the economic projections, and the states must pay attention to this. He added that it is a tall order to predict concurrent hydraulic and environmental effects. Mike Cockerill said that the first step is to bring this as a bona fide issue to the Liaison Committee, and then perhaps to the IPR. Bill stated that for anyone from Missouri to suggest that there will be no future navigation is 'pie in the sky'. It is too important to the economy of the state, he said, and the situation there is much different than upriver. Wilcox maintained that the states have an opportunity to review the economic models; Jack Carr's presentation at a previous NECC meeting noted that the economic projections will be made by an independent contractor.

Kevin Szcodronski repeated a fundamental question from early on in the navigation studies: 'What do we want the river to look like 50 years from now?' He felt that the Corps has its vision (as originally posed by Col. Brown), but the states have not had an opportunity to propose their vision. Kevin said the result is that he has difficulty in briefing administrators on this project, and that now he needs to ask this question again. Dan Wilcox asked how the COE vision compares with what the people want. Kevin answered that the Corps needs help with the question, because the river belongs to everyone. Mike Cockerill asserted that NEPA does not ask what we want things to look like, but to assess the current situation and the given plan. Dan Wilcox felt that Col. Brown's question was asking in effect what is our management plan. Mike thought that we are perhaps second-guessing Col. Brown's inference; all players should have a vision and bring it to the table, both through master and management plans. Kevin Szcodronski responded that the whole point of the ecosystem management plan is to bring a vision to the table, and that the Corps has a navigation vision only. Steve Johnson seconded this point, and added that if navigation is to 'face demise', the state of Minnesota can start planning for that; currently the state depends economically on river navigation.

Jerry Rombach asked Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid if the GLC raised some of these issues, or did they get lost in the larger questions of flood impacts, the river economy, employment, etc.? [response not recorded] Kevin Szcodronski reiterated that the Corps study is geared toward saying 'we will have expanded navigation' rather than 'what does the nation want?' He added that the Mississippi is more than transportation, and he is not convinced that the Corps economists will end up saying that expansion is not needed. Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid said in response that the Corps would not be opposed to a wider transportation study. Kevin thought that the Iowa GLC representative would investigate the Corps position. Tom Pullen said that NEPA requires more than just a look at the NED plan, and indicated that other ideas can be considered. Jon Duyvejonck responded that the 'EQ' plan was proposed, and rejected. Tom said he was actually proposing something shorter of the 'EQ' plan. Ken Barr explained that an array

of alternatives will be evaluated to meet any justified navigation expansion. Related to this issue, Tom Keevin noted that he investigated Corps authority for 'EQ' planning, but the question is really one of level; we have the authority, but we can only go so far within funding constraints, i. e., without cost-sharing. Kevin Szcodronski said that the Corps could have been more pro-active with an 'EQ' plan, and that we are not 'jibing' with the Corps' 'new environmental emphasis'. Mike Cockerill responded that no matter what is said, the Chief is constrained dollar-wise and planning-wise. Don Williams questioned how the Corps could be expected to do this type of planning, dollar-wise, when the FWS cannot do it. Dan Wilcox thought that a possible partnership opportunity existed between the Corps, the National Biological Survey, the U. S. Geological Survey and the EMTC to look at a multi-task effort of predicting the future condition of the river just a physical standpoint. He added that we biologists like to be 'policy wonks' and try to resolve political issues. More important here is attention to the technical aspects of study plans for impact assessment.

14. Partner's Reports - Steve Johnson referred to pages 4 and 5 of the minutes from the last NECC meeting, regarding the status of a Corps response to the Sam Marler letter and the issue of assessing a future without condition. Don Williams replied that the response is now on MG Genega's (COE Director of Civil Works) desk ready to be signed. The response to the EPA letter to Lower Mississippi Valley Division is being held back until the Marler letter is signed. It was asked if the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works (ASA) position is still vacant. Mike Cockerill responded that this is true, and that Dr. Dickey is still acting. Steve Johnson said that this atmosphere of non-responsiveness is eroding the credibility of the Corps, and that agency 'consultation' is a misnomer because questions are not being answered. Steve then read the following statement for the record:

"Minnesota is concerned about (the) appearance of non-responsiveness and the lack of credibility that results from that. This process has the appearance of not being established to provide for comprehensive evaluation of environmental impacts, but to provide a facade that suggests the environment may be addressed and environmental agencies consulted. But this does not appear to be a consultation process and the Corps' inability to even respond to letters from the FWS and EPA demonstrate(s) that this process is not taken seriously by Corps leadership. The State of Minnesota feels it is important to put the Corps on notice that our presence at these (NECC) meetings does not imply that we support this process."

Gretchen Benjamin said that a series of briefings have been held for central office staff of the Wisconsin DNR and the Secretary on the navigation studies and NEPA compliance issues. She added that Wisconsin will participate in necessary meetings, but like Minnesota this participation does not mean they are buying off on the process. Ken Barr emphasized at this point the necessity of liaison with the GLC. Kevin Szcodronski spoke for Iowa, and had nothing specific to add, other than they are looking forward to the work group study plans as they are produced. He added that even though individual studies may look good, the Kevin overall study process (the 'big picture') needs to be kept in mind as they are reviewed. Kevin also said that the Ecosystem Management Strategy is progressing, with final touches now being added to the Call to Action report. Institutional arrangements for the Strategy will need another look, and perhaps the UMRBA will help in this regard. At this point it is a planning exercise, and the institutional arrangements may change with implementation. Kevin continued to explain that a specific river reach may be examined to explore what might go into the plan, and better define ecosystem management. The LTRM monitoring pools will likely be used for this exercise. Kevin noted that the regional director of the Fish and Wildlife Service has been contacted to see if the UMRCC coordinator can get additional staff to help out with the EMS. He concluded by saying that every meeting will help define the process a bit more. Reporting for Illinois, Butch Atwood stated that Pool 25 may be better suited for a site-specific for a site specific EMS study. He said that the MICRA (Mississippi Interstate Cooperative Resource Agreement) process will also look at the lower river in this regard. Butch added that the Batchtown EMP project on Pool 25 illustrates the need to look at

engineering alternatives that now take an ecosystem approach to management. One driving force should be the shape of the hydrograph, but also dams should be designed with an 'eco-sensitive' approach. Jon Duyvejonck, representing the Fish and Wildlife Service, had nothing more to add on the EMS, but reiterated several outstanding concerns as noted elsewhere in the minutes. In terms of input for the next agenda, Jon said this will be brought to the NECC under the auspices of their Coordination Act Report (CAR); it is taking some time for the FWS to fine-tune the details of what is needed.

Reporting for MARC 2000, Jerry Rombach said that Chris Brescia could not attend this meeting due to a scheduling conflict. His organization is concerned with the issue of economic impacts, and they have a study underway using industry data to examine this issue. He said that the results could be brought to future meetings. Reporting from a Corps Division perspective, Don Williams (NCD) said that the plan to reduce the number of divisions from 11 to 6 seems to be back on the table vis-a-vis the Gore (National Performance Review) plan. Tom Pullen (LMV) said that post-flood studies are being considered for funding by HQUSACE, and there is a proposal to get more dollars for this purpose. The emphasis would be on EMP-HREP impacts, aerial photography, basic ecosystem impacts and possible future planning. The funds would be spread over all affected Districts. He said that reorganization is now another 'dark cloud' hanging over things, and pointed to the need for good Division/District coordination as this matter is resolved. Tom added that the NECC process needs to attack the problem of issue resolution more forcefully and pointed to the concern being expressed over definition of future non-project river conditions as an example of an issue in need of resolution. Speaking for the St. Louis District, Rich Astrack said that a contract will be awarded soon for the physical modeling studies, and that products are expected soon on the ISWS data analysis. From Rock Island District, it was reported that Ken Barr will be picking up most of the NECC responsibilities in the near future.

15. New or Unscheduled Business - Jon Duyvejonck noted that a river boat trip is still being proposed to get agency 'brass' out to see what problems and opportunities the river presents. At this point, arrangements may not be made until next spring or summer; some problems could still arise.

16. Next Meeting - The next meeting was rescheduled to November 9, at 800 a.m. This will avoid conflict with the Environmental Roundtable. This will be the last meeting Some of 1993. Some discussion ensued on scheduling of future meetings, and it was generally agreed to again establish a schedule of meetings for the entire year with dates approximately 2 months apart. The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER
NAVIGATION ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
15 September 1993

Name	Agency
Jon Duyvejonck Terri Jacobson	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Rock Island Field Office
Bill Donels Butch Atwood	Illinois Department of Conservation (IDOC)
Kevin Szcodronski Bernard Schonhoff	Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)
Gretchen Benjamin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)
Bill Dieffenbach	Missouri Department of Conservation (MDOC)
David Soong	Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS)
Jerry Rombach	Midwest Area Rivers Coalition (MARC 2000)
Steve Johnson Tim Schlagenhaft	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR)
Mike Cockerill Ken Barr Bob Vanderjack Dorie Bollman Teresa Kirkeeng-Kincaid Rich Fristik	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District (CENCR)
Richard Astrack Tom Keevin	St. Louis District (CELMS)
Dan Wilcox	St. Paul District (CENCS)
Don Williams	North Central Division (CENCD)
Tom Pullen	Lower Mississippi Valley Division (CELMV)

MEETING MINUTES
NAVIGATION ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE
Moline Holiday inn
September 15, 1993

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 8: 00 a.m., with representatives present from the Corps of Engineers, the five Upper Mississippi River states, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Illinois State Water Survey and MARC 2000. Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and corrections presented. An overview was given of the 9th annual Environmental Roundtable, for which the Corps is the host agency this year. The Roundtable will be held November 2-4, 1993, in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. Effects of the flood on the navigation studies were discussed. Some delays in study progress have occurred due to flood-related diversion of personnel and work priorities. Standard operating procedures for technical work groups were discussed and agreed to. Reports were given on the mussel impacts and adult fish work groups. Each group has met once, and draft study plans have been prepared. The plans will require further discussion and refinement. A status report was also given on the math modeling work group and the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). The modeling group will likely have its first meeting in early October, while the national Academy of Sciences is now being explored to fulfill the TCC role.

Fish and Wildlife Service representatives summarized their ongoing data collection efforts for site-specific impact assessments. A proposed schedule for other work group meetings was discussed. These groups include the fish early life stages, side channel/backwater sedimentation, and recreation impacts. A report was given on the Governor's POC meeting of August 31. This group will now be known as the Governor's Liaison Committee. Considerable discussion took place on approaches to issue resolution. The states' position on the 'future-without' condition remains at odds with the Corps', but discussion continues on this and other outstanding issues. The states and other organizations present reported on their issues of concern as well as general information. The states expressed concern over the appearance of non-responsiveness on the part of the Corps in addressing state and agency concerns. Unscheduled business was discussed as well as future meeting schedule. The last NECC meeting of the year will be on November 9, 1993. The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.